

CLERK'S OFFICE U.S. DIST. COURT
AT LYNCHBURG, VA
FILED
4/22/2019
JULIA C. DUDLEY, CLERK
BY: s/ C. Amos
DEPUTY CLERK

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
LYNCHBURG DIVISION**

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,
Plaintiff,

v.

GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,
Defendants.

6:19-cv-00013

JUDGE NORMAN K. MOON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,
Plaintiff,

v.

GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,
Defendants.

6:19-cv-00016

JUDGE NORMAN K. MOON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,
Petitioner,

v.

GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,
Respondents.

6:19-cv-00017

JUDGE NORMAN K. MOON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

OPINION AND ORDER

The Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed complaints in each case against Assistant United States Attorney Gregory K. Harris and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In each case, Plaintiff has submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* but will dismiss the complaint in each case as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Each complaint alleges that the Joint Chiefs of Staff “created Mr. Grant in the basement of the Pentagon in 1990 to be ‘the Judge’ as to whether the Vietnam War constituted war crimes.” He continues with dozens of disjointed and fantastic allegations, many of which overlap from complaint to complaint, and seeks compensatory damages of \$99 trillion in each case.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), a district court has a duty to screen initial filings and dismiss a complaint filed *in forma pauperis* if the court determines that the action “(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” The Court is mindful of its obligation to liberally construe self-represented pleadings. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 90-95 (2007). The complaints, however, state no recognizable causes of action but rather “describe[e] fantastic or delusional scenarios, claims with which federal district judges are all too familiar.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). As one court recently noted, quoting an opinion from the Eastern District of Virginia with respect to this same Plaintiff: “Plaintiff is a serial filer of frivolous litigation in various federal courts across the country, . . . [and] the vast majority of [P]laintiff’s cases have been dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).” *Grant v. U.S. Dept. of Defense*, No. 4:18-CV-00443-ALM-CAN, 2019 WL 1009405, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 25, 2019) (Nowak, M.J.) (quoting *Grant v. United States Dept. of Treasury*, Case No. 1:18-cv-457 (E.D. Va. May 1, 2018), *appeal dismissed as frivolous*, 740 F. App’x 333 (4th Cir. 2018) (unpublished per curiam)), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2019 WL 1003642 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 1, 2019).

The Court notes that Plaintiff also filed complaints in at least four similar, additional actions in the Western District of Virginia, all of which have been dismissed as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Grant v. Joint Chiefs of Staff*, No. 1:19-cv-00013 (W.D. Va.; dkt. 3); *Grant v. Harris, et al.*, 1:19-cv-00014 (W.D. Va.; dkt. 3); *Grant v. Harris, et al.*, 1:19-

cv-00015 (W.D. Va.; dkt. 3); *Grant v. Harris*, No. 5:19-CV-24 (W.D. Va.; dkt. 3, 4)). This Court will dismiss the complaint in each case before this Court as frivolous.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis in each case is **GRANTED**; Plaintiff's pro se complaint in each case is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); and each case is **STRICKEN** from the active docket of the Court.

The Clerk of Court is directed to file this Opinion and Order in each captioned case, send a copy of the Order to the pro se Plaintiff, and close the cases.

Entered this 22nd day of April, 2019.


NORMAN K. MOON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE